

Advice from an Editor on Writing and Publishing Journal Articles in Culture-Oriented Psychology

James H. Liu*

Abstract

As former Editor-in-Chief of *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, and current co-Editor-in-Chief of *Political Psychology*, I offer recommendations for writing and publishing culture-oriented psychology articles in international journals. Beginning with the long-term perspective of career development, I argue that ethical conduct in human relationships is the foundation of establishing a productive research program. Teacher-student, colleague-to-colleague, mentor-mentee, and membership in academic associations are important relationships for developing a human-hearted (仁道) approach to research. According to the Confucian approach to teaching and learning, cultivating character alongside with the social roles that make up academic life will enrich one's research and result in a growth that integrates one's personhood and career. Moving on to instrumental considerations, knowledge of the different market segments in international literature is important to appropriately pitch your research. I argue that thinking of oneself as a culture-oriented scholar capable of using cross-cultural or indigenous psychology tools to answer questions in different domains is more adaptive than limiting oneself to one or the other. I illustrate with the different markets available to different forms of culture-oriented psychology and use the cocktail party and the sandwich as models to guide research writing. To conclude, I propose the idea that Confucian Psychology may be an important future pathway for Chinese indigenous psychology.

Keywords: publishing research, indigenous psychology, cross-cultural psychology, relational ethics, Confucian psychology

James H. Liu* School of Psychology, Massey University, New Zealand
(J.h.liu@massey.ac.nz)

As former Editor-in-Chief of *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, and current co-Editor-in-Chief of *Political Psychology*, I offer practical advice for writing and publishing culture-oriented and indigenous psychology (IP) articles in international journals. My advice falls into three categories. First, consider your research from a career perspective, not just from the perspective of a single journal article or project. This means investing in both practical knowledge (which is often local), and knowledge of the English language and the international market. It means that you try to build up collaborative networks through relational ethics. Second, have a strategy for constructing multiple journal articles from a research project that maximizes your chances for getting successful outcomes. This involves dividing the project into different pieces, and knowing which pieces go to what journal. It requires knowing your journals and writing for specific markets (because different markets have different rules for publication). Third, invest fully in the process of revision after review. Don't get impatient, but learn how to craft nuanced revisions with appropriate revise-and-resubmit letters. You must be able to take criticism from reviewers seriously (but not so seriously as to become depressed), and accommodate their suggestions for making changes as far as is practical. The process of peer review and revision is one of the best graduate schools that the psychology community has developed over the past decades, and you don't have to pay school fees to get into it. As you develop your expertise and attract recognition from peers, you will be invited to review manuscripts, the experience of which can be very rewarding.

Extending above and beyond this functional advice, as you develop in your career, it helps to know your own strengths and weaknesses. Establishing good working habits for yourself, and good relationships with the people you enjoy working with: this is part of a holistic pattern for long term development. Enjoy the quest for knowledge as part of a lifelong journey of self-cultivation (Liu, 2021; Y. Liu & Y. Liu, 2021).

「知之者不如好之者，好之者不如樂之者」 < Those who know the truth are not equal to those who love knowing it, and those who love knowing the truth are not equal to those who delight in knowing it.¹ > *The Analects*, Ch.6, v.18

Research from a Career Perspective

¹ I am grateful for this translation, provided by Professor Sik Hung Ng. My own translation was more circumspect, and probably less wise: "Those who know a thing are not as those who love it, and those who love a thing are no match for those who take joy in it." Such exegesis in a community of scholars is part of the joy of studying *The Analects*

Getting a PhD and embarking on an academic career should be a labor of love. It should not be solely for instrumental gain: there are many other domains (like business) where a smart and hard-working person can achieve greater instrumental success (e.g. salary, benefits). So if that is what you are after (and that's fine, every country needs good business people!), it is better not to choose to become an academic. An academic should love teaching and learning as an end to itself. Good teacher-student relationships are foundational to establishing a good research program as an end to itself, and not as a means to an end. Teaching is the most immediate way that an academic can make a difference in people's lives. It provides clues to what is important about your research. As you lecture about your research in the context of teaching, you can see and hear what matters to your students. Your first responsibility as an academic is to be a good teacher, and to be a good teacher, you have to be a good learner. Your research should not be so abstract as to be irrelevant to your surroundings, it should be compatible (Yang, 1999; 2008). It can connect to your local context in a number of ways, spanning practical (as in getting involved with social issues or policy reform in your society) and academic issues (advancing research on social issues of relevance to your society). Such rootedness would make you a better teacher and give a firmer sense of direction and purpose to your academic career.

「吾日三省吾身：為人謀而不忠乎？與朋友交而不信乎？傳不習乎」 <I daily examine my personal conduct on three points: Have I been conscientious in carrying out duties entrusted to me? Have I been trustworthy and sincere in my social interactions with friends? Have I failed to practice what I teach?> *The Analects* Ch.1. v.4

As a research supervisor, you learn to combine your own interests in becoming a productive researcher with your students' interests in development and learning. This involves the golden mean of not being too narrow as to become boring and stultified, but also not becoming so general that you are expert in nothing. It is the duty of the scholar to become expert in something, be it statistical methods, qualitative methods, theory construction in a particular area, experimental design, community connectedness, ethics, depth of knowledge in an area, breadth of knowledge across areas, moral leadership, or whatever else suits you. I use my expertise in cross-cultural psychology (and its method of collecting data in more than one country or population and making comparisons between them) to form the axis of my research and supervision. I typically do not supervise a student in isolation, but as a part of my research program and as a part of a research team. Sometimes I am a leader in a research team, and sometimes I am in a supportive role. Different relational ethics govern appropriate conduct in these different research roles (Hopner & Liu, 2020); but across all situations, ren (仁, variously

translated as human-heartedness or benevolence), is central, as a means of connecting oneself to others in a way that cultivates character in the self (S. H. Liu, 1998).

Mastery of theory and methods is the key to long term success in publishing in international journals. To become successful in your career, you need to master a particular research method as your “bread-and-butter”. I have learned how to do qualitative research. I can do experimental research. But I make my living on cross-cultural survey research. Over time, I have accumulated expertise that makes me very comfortable about how to design projects that are easy to publish in the area of culture and psychology. The theoretical stories I tell have seemed to emerge organically over time, from the subject matter and the methods of research. In the particular pathway to learning I have experienced, theorizing has emerged out of my methodological practices in cross-cultural and indigenous psychology, cross-pollinated with (mostly Western) theories of intergroup relations (e.g. Liu et al., 2010; Liu & Sibley, 2009). I think most researchers in psychology (including myself) are better at teaching their students research methods than how to construct theory. Constructing theory seems to be a mysterious process, something that is more intuitive, part of a habit of mind and a perspective, more than a conscious effort of will. To build theoretical expertise I think it is helpful to read widely, and to cross-pollinate one area with ideas from another. This must be done carefully, and not superficially. To create a theoretical synthesis often takes time, and practice. Cross-pollinating indigenous concepts and theory with mainstream theories and methods is necessary to achieve notoriety in the international realm.

Making a good research design using the appropriate methods is less difficult. Methods are where indigenous research and mainstream research come together. An ANOVA is an ANOVA, whether written in Chinese or in English. A thematic analysis is a thematic analysis, with slight differences emerging when written in Chinese or in English. In survey research, representative samples are more valuable than convenience samples, for both indigenous psychology and in the mainstream. If I have a large sum of research money, and am involved in a large-scale cross-cultural project, I will design it in a way that many people (including my research students, and colleagues from other countries) can carve out smaller projects from the overall research design. There is a reasonably simple formula to decide what measures to include to produce publishable cross-cultural research, and these choices are usually constrained by funding. For instance, on that rare occasion when I was able to get a really big grant, I mobilized a large collective of researchers who published more than 30 papers from a single (two wave) dataset involving 19 countries (see <https://www.dropbox.com/s/oko40j9uzzh1i8j/Digital%20Influence%20World%20Project%20Research%20Output.docx?dl=0>).

Besides, I love to travel, I love to meet people from other countries, I love theorizing about similarities and differences between them. So I have built my life into my research, and my research into my preferred life style. It is adaptive, because single country, culture-oriented psychology, including indigenous psychology, is harder to publish internationally. In the currency of empirical research, two cultures are usually better than one (for reasons why, see Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Henrich et al., 2010).

At this relatively late stage in my career (I plan to retire within 10 years), I consider it my duty to mentor early career academics to publish. I like to share data with them to enable them to do well. I feel an inter-generational responsibility to pay forward the mentorship I received from older masters when I was young (see Ng, Loong et al., 2000, for the first big project I was ever invited to take part in, led by New Zealand-Hong Kong scholar Sik Hung Ng). At earlier stages in my career, when I had little to no research money and I was not well known, I enjoyed meeting people from other countries and collaborating with them, on smaller projects suited my status as an early career researcher. I was very lucky to meet some very fine people. It was only through working with them that I was able to achieve some success (see Liu & Huang, 2002, for early efforts). I was usually (but not always) reliable in getting research work done, and developed trust with a good number of colleagues. I was always conscientious and trustworthy in attending to my official in the academic association where I chose to invest my time and efforts (i.e. the Asian Association of Social Psychology, see Liu & Ng, 2007). No one is an island, so you should establish yourself among colleagues you share a common interest with, and develop a good reputation among those you trust, admire, and appreciate. This means becoming identified and becoming devoted to one or two academic associations, and taking a role in working for the public good through these.

「君子以文會友，以友輔仁」 <A person of noble character (junzi) makes friends through their taste in literature, culture, and the arts. Friends help him (or her) to live a moral life>

Research from an Instrumental Perspective

At this moment in history, English is the lingua franca of the world, and is the language of international journals (see Sun et al., 2015 for its impact on Chinese universities). There are only 4-5 psychology journals in Taiwan, and maybe another 8-12 in China. That makes less than 20 Chinese language psychology journals in total. There are at least 100 psychology journals that publish in English. If you relax the criteria of entry in the SSCI, there are even

more. So the opportunities are much greater for publishing in English. But you have to acquire knowledge of specific markets in this sea of possibilities.

If you have English as a Second Language (ESL), you should form a habit of using English every day. The only way to improve your reading and writing is to practice. I would advise young academics to engage in many rather than few projects, write more papers, get more experience at submitting papers, and discover what gets them accepted versus rejected. There is no substitute for practice. English is a language without consistent grammatical rules, so it is useful to listen to how it is spoken by natives (e.g. online lessons and recordings). Try to develop an ear for grammatically correct English, practice writing yourself, and then have it corrected by a native-English speaker. Learn from their feedback to eventually be able to correct your mistakes yourself.

「溫故而知新，可以為師矣」 <One who constantly goes over what he or she has learned, and continually adds new learning, can become a teacher of humanity> *The Analects*, Ch 2, v.11.

I teach my students to write journal articles using two metaphors. First, for the overall story design and abstract, the metaphor is of a cocktail party. At a cocktail party, everyone is dressed up and trying to look good, and scanning the crowded room looking for others to talk to. If you bore them, they will find someone else to approach. An abstract that captures succinctly the essence of your writing project, is like being successful at becoming a center of attention at a cocktail party. This means being able to describe the essence of your project in 30 seconds or less. What is important in most journal articles can be summed up in 3-4 paragraphs, and these paragraphs are the ones that can be used to form the essence of the introduction to your paper.

Second is the sandwich model. A psychology paper is like a sandwich where the parts have to fit together in the correct proportions to be good to eat. The introduction and the discussion are like the pieces of bread that hold the salad (the methods) and the meat (results) together in a sandwich. The different parts have to fit together- anything in the introduction should lead to something in the method or results. You do not raise issues in the introduction for scholarly completeness only (at least, not when writing in English). If a piece of literature does not connect to your own research, but is just related to the area in general, then leave it out². The introduction should lead like a funnel to the research questions or hypotheses, that lead logically to a research design and presentation of results. The discussion should revisit

² I do not think this is true in some Chinese language journals, where a longer, more comprehensive literature review is perhaps more typical

themes in the introduction, and show how the paper has advanced the literature, theoretically and practically. A sandwich with big pieces of bread and a small piece of meat will be rejected. A sandwich with a big piece of meat and a little bread will not taste good.

When I write a journal article, I write it with an audience in mind. Some audiences, like those in *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, or *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, I know very well. I design research and write it up well-framed for an audience that agrees with me. In these journals, I do not get rejected much. I find the American mainstream more difficult. I have not often designed and written research for the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, which is the most prestigious journal in social psychology, because in general, it does not agree with me. It is your responsibility to learn the rules of the publication game for your area of expertise. This means finding a home for research that expresses who you are as an academic.

「君子不器」 <A person of noble character (junzi) will not make him or herself into a machine fit only to do one kind of work.> *The Analects*, Ch 2, v.12.

It is a good idea to read the editorial written by the Editor-in-Chief before you submit an article to a journal. You should read articles in a journal you intend to submit to, rather than just look at its impact factor. Is your paper suited to the needs of the Editor-in-Chief and the journal? Is the journal quantitative or qualitative or theoretical? If your paper is experimental, it is also important to know if the journal requires multiple experiments. Does the journal value research from non-Western countries, or is it unselfconscious about its WEIRDness (Henrich et al., 2010)? Although you can learn much from editorial statements and recently published papers, much knowledge of the market for a journal is implicit, gained through the experience of submission, revision, and rejection. Journals are strict about word limits and referencing style, so you have to learn their rules. Deeper than that, you need to learn what their implicit values are.

Culture Oriented Journals.

The journals specializing in culture-oriented research are obvious target markets for indigenous psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology (AJSP)* should be familiar to most indigenous psychology scholars in Asia. AJSP and the other official journal of the Asian Association of Social Psychology the *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, are both crafted by the association and by the journals' editors to be open to indigenous psychology. Similarly,

Psychology and Developing Societies is also specifically oriented to be open to indigenous psychology submissions.

These days, a lot of university committees responsible for staff appraisal and promotion look at the impact factor of journals you publish in (how many times the average paper in the journal is cited in the first two years after publication), as a quantitative indicator of the prestige of the journal. They also look at citation counts of what you publish, as an indication of the academic influence of your work. The impact factors of these three journals are typically in the 0.5-1.3 range, which is towards the lower end of journals in psychology. This does not mean that papers published here will not be well-cited. My most cited paper in AJSP (Liu et al., 2002, 164 citations according to Google Scholar) is a paper comparing two Asian societies. I strongly advise indigenous psychologists not to think of themselves as only doing indigenous psychology, but to be flexible in using their theories, methods, and practices with respect to culture to publish in either indigenous, comparative (i.e. cross-cultural), or even mainstream science (i.e. cultural evolution).

The flagship journal for cross-cultural psychology is *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology (JCCP)*; it is also an obvious target market for indigenous psychology research, as it “publishes papers that focus on the interrelations between culture and psychological processes. Submitted manuscripts may report results from either cross-cultural comparative research or single culture studies³”. A little less influential, and slightly more limited in range, but otherwise in the same category as JCCP is the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*: it is devoted to *inter*-cultural issues. The *International Journal of Psychology* is also designed to be open to global scholars. All these journals tend to be oriented towards quantitative methods, and JCCP especially is known for publishing papers with cross-cultural comparisons. The enterprising indigenous psychologist should consider examining indigenous concepts by comparing Taiwan, Hong Kong, and China (or extending this comparison to populations with important Chinese cultural influences, like S. Korea, Malaysia, or the Philippines). They have impact factors around 1.7-2.1. There are also culture-oriented journals that are oriented towards qualitative methods, like *Culture and Psychology*. It has an impact factor similar to AJSP. I will not attempt to cover the many culture-oriented journals in anthropology, as I know little about them, but *Ethos* is worth taking a look at for qualitative researchers, as it is the official journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology (and has an impact factor similar to AJSP).

³ See <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/journal-of-cross-cultural-psychology/journal200947#aims-and-scope>

Other Specialty Area Journals.

One advantage of the international market is that there is almost certain to be at least one or two journals in whatever area of research you specialize in. Often, these journals are published by academic associations. It may be therefore worthwhile for you to go to their conference if it overlaps with your area of interest. For example, my own research focuses intergroup relations and culture. The *European Journal of Social Psychology* (EJSP), and the *British Journal of Social Psychology* are both oriented towards group and intergroup issues, more so than mainstream American psychology (IFs for these journals are typically in the 2's). EJSP has been particularly open to my articles on social representations of history (e.g. Liu & Robinson, 2016). Accordingly, I have attended European Association of Social Psychology meetings more often than American ones. *Political Psychology* bridges the areas of political science and social psychology, and is also oriented towards intergroup relations. Recently, I attended a meeting of the International Association of Political Psychology in San Antonio. This group is largely made up of American and European scholars, but the keynote speech of the President (Eva Green) described the association's effort to internationalize beyond these established constituencies. To my surprise, I was asked to put in a bid to become Editor-in-Chief of their flagship journal, and together with Orla Muldoon, we won a competitive bidding process. In the editorial statement Orla and I wrote, we have signaled our commitment to open up this high impact journal (recent IF=3.3) to authors from the Global South (Muldoon & Liu, 2020). This would certainly include indigenous psychology that is political, and is anchored to the culture and praxis of developing societies.

These are journals I know well and understand. Another person, with a different set of research interests would have a different body of specialized knowledge. For instance, there are many journals in personality, perhaps just as many in health psychology. Fanny Cheung is internationally renowned for her work on indigenous personality (e.g. Cheung & Leung, 1998; Cheung et al., 2004). Pat Dudgeon (2017) is an expert on indigenous mental health. Whatever your area is, family (Chen et al., 2016), close relationships (Huang, 2016), wisdom (S. Y. Yang, 2014), emotions, social cognition, clinical, counselling, communications, ethics, theory, etc, you need to become familiar with the journals in your area, their editorial practices, the academic associations that maintain these practices, and individuals within them open to what you have to offer.

Mainstream Evolutionary Science

Recent advances in the ability of researchers to use commercial providers to collect data online makes the methods of cross-cultural psychology much more viable for entry into mainstream journals. Many American researchers are using MTurk samples, which are less desirable than representative samples. For a few thousand dollars, you can get a near representative survey sample from a commercial internet polling company (these companies mainly do marketing research for companies) from many countries that has greater academic value. If you have a good indigenous theory, you can test it cross-culturally quite easily now, you just need to get your survey measure translated, and have a good theory about how it works across cultures.

Because I inherited a course in Evolution, Mind, and Culture to teach when I moved to Massey University in 2015 (we are restricted from opening new courses according to the university's cost cutting measures), I've slowly picked up some cutting-edge theory in culture and evolution through teaching and learning. A master problem in the theory of evolution is to explain human prosociality, sometimes described as "altruism" (Batson, 2011). People like Richard Dawkins and Robert Trivers reduced human prosocial behavior to the mathematics of kin selection and genetic relatedness (e.g., it is ok that I sacrifice my life for 2 but not 1 sibling, since I share 50% genetic material with them). This was the dominant position in evolutionary theory towards the second half of the 20th century, before more a sophisticated model of gene-culture co-evolution emerged (Wilson & Wilson, 2007). As articulated best (in short form) by Richerson et al. (2016), gene-culture co-evolution theory summarizes growing evidence that the human propensity for prosocial behavior cannot be explained without invoking group-based selection. If genetics is the "ultimate cause" of human propensities, this factor is in turn historically contingent on selection based on group-level factors, most importantly institutions and their normative features that produce cooperation (or conflict) between self-interested individuals. The survival of different kinds of individuals (e.g. selfish vs parochial⁴) and the genes they carry depends on the groups they are part of, and the groups they are in competition with or in exchange relationships with (Choi & Bowles, 2007). There might be a "selfish gene" (as Dawkins called it), but human collectives have developed to manage these tendencies through collective action that is contingent on effective communications and adaptive social norms (see the Nobel Prize winning work of Ostrom, 1998).

This development brings culture-oriented psychology into dialogue with cutting-edge evolutionary theory, the most prestigious theory of human science accepted by natural

⁴ This means ingroup favouring, willing to fight and die on behalf of the ingroup

scientists. It opens the door to culture-oriented psychologists publishing in super high impact factor journals like *Science* or *Nature* (Impact Factors in the 40s; JPSP is 6.3). Gelfand et al. (2011) published student cross-cultural data on loose and tight cultures in *Science*, which has been very good for her career. As part of a grant where we collected data across cultures to examine the impact of mass media use on social behaviors (Liu et al., 2018, 2020⁵), I invited evolutionary social psychologists specializing the study of cooperation (or prosocial behavior or altruism) to put in a game theoretical measure of cooperation in Wave 2 of our 4 Wave longitudinal survey. Results of our trust game (Romano et al., 2017). showed that across cultures, people trusted their national ingroup members more than national outgroup members, particularly when they had concerns about their reputation (e.g. when knowledge of their actions in the game were known to other people rather than hidden). Contrary to dominant practices in social psychology, where hypothesis confirmation is the norm for published papers, the fact that we found no support for three important country-level moderators of ingroup favoritism in trust (material security, religiosity, and pathogen prevalence), and our bounded reciprocity hypothesis was not confirmed, did not prevent the article from being accepted by *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (PNAS, an IF=10 journal). In a subsequent, single wave study (Romano et al., under review) from the same grant, we substituted the prisoner's dilemma game for the trust game and administered this to 42 countries. We found universal ingroup favoritism across cultures, and actually got past desktop rejection, but ultimately failed to get accepted in *Science*. Still, this paper was accepted in *Nature Communications*, also an IF=10 journal.

I would never have been able to achieve these successes on my own: I was not familiar with the natural science conventions that govern the formatting of papers in these journals (e.g. short overall, with little exposition in the introduction, and a tight method section, where all details of the materials and procedures are in supplementary materials, published online); and I am still not sufficiently comfortable with evolutionary theorizing. The thought that pathogen stress should govern ingroup favoritism would never have occurred to me as a serious explanation for variances in ingroup favoritism across modern countries. But there is widespread belief in the natural sciences that ingroup favoritism is an evolutionary adaptation to a physical environment where there is a lot of disease, that prompts behaviors and social norms to keep outsiders at a distance. I generally do not favor this type of mechanical cause-to-effect theory, but it is a norm in evolutionary science that I submit to in this context. Hence, my

⁵ For a listing of the many publications from this grant, most first-authored by junior academics, see <https://www.dropbox.com/s/oko40j9uzzh1i8j/Digital%20Influence%20World%20Project%20Research%20Output.docx?dl=0>

publications in this area are more tactical and short-term than strategic (and long-term). Even so, my collaborative work in this area is in accord with relational ethics, and leverages interconnectedness (Hopner & Liu, 2020).

My main contributions were to provide the samples and the human relationships for our team effort. Toshio Yamagishi was the senior member of our research team, who mentored us through the process of submission to PNAS. We had worked together several times before through our mutual participation in the Asian Association of Social Psychology (AASP). He did not know Dan Balliet well, or Angelo Romano (Dan's post-doctoral fellow) previous to this collaboration. Our collaboration provided a test of his bounded reciprocity hypothesis (that only ingroup reputation, and not reputation among outgroup members, matters in fostering cooperation) that was not confirmed. I admired the good grace with which Toshio accepted the empirical results.

I learned to think more in a natural science way, where "behavior" is all important, and not in a social psychological way, where you rely mainly on attitudes and other social constructions. Attitudes and beliefs in these natural science journals are treated as suspect, whereas monetary exchange (even if the currency is imagined) in a game theory paradigm is treated as "real". I learned to think more like my friend Toshio, who was one of the most rational thinkers I ever met. Through their staunch supporter of AASP, Toshio Yamagishi and Susumu Yamagishi taught me, an ethnic Chinese who grew up with prejudice against Japanese as a consequence of the Sino-Japanese Wars, to appreciate Japan as part of Asia (see Liu & Kashima, 1995). Sadly, Toshio passed away from cancer over the course of this last collaboration. His presence as an author in our second paper is posthumous. I am to this day deeply appreciative of Dan Balliet, who made the gesture to include Toshio on our second paper. It gives me joy to think that Toshio would have been happy with how we have continued with his work. Through such relationships, your scholarship can grow over time.

Cross-cultural methods can open doors to publication in the highest impact journals in the world, far above the top journals in social psychology. But the rules of the game in these journals are completely alien to most of indigenous and culture-oriented psychology, that puts so much emphasis on attitudes and beliefs. I emphasize that my pathway to learning here has been rooted in my idiosyncratic interests in culture and intergroup relations. Others have found success infusing culture into other mainstream psychology domains: for example Ng et al. (2010) did an innovative fMRI study demonstrating the cultural plasticity of the brain through culture priming of bicultural Hong Kong Chinese. In their study, Western priming increased, whereas Chinese priming decreased the neural differentiation of mother from self. The work of

Shihui Han (e.g. Han et al., 2013) and colleagues, showing culture-sensitive neural substrates of human cognition has been exemplary in this domain.

Where culture-oriented psychology can in the long run make a difference is to articulate stronger, indigenously grounded theories of social norms. It is these norms that may govern cooperative social exchange in different cultures, as much or more than individual attitudes and beliefs. This is the essence of Gelfand et al.'s (2011) *Science* paper, and culture-oriented psychologists should learn from her example, and theorize more boldly. Surely the insights of indigenous psychology are not confined to the borders of just one society, especially given the diversity of Chinese speaking populations today?

Conclusion

Instrumental concerns about journal impact factors should not dictate scholarship, though they may influence how much time and energy one puts into different activities at different stages of an academic career. At this late stage in my career, where I have much freedom, I have been investing time and effort into developing Confucian Psychology. This is unlikely to yield much in terms of short-term instrumental benefits for my career, but may be important in the collective future of others. It is more of a joyful duty, a normative obligation, and a way of connecting to the culture of my ancestors, including my Father, who was a New Confucian philosopher (Liu & Liu, 1997). Confucianism was historically responsible for establishing regulative norms to guide the behavior of officials (and ordinary people) in dynastic China. This contributed to societal stability and bureaucratic performance, because traditional Chinese society was not able to use the law as an effective means of constraining the arbitrary power of authorities (Liu et al., 2010). How different are things today?

It seems that the current paramount leader of the People's Republic China (PRC) would like to see Confucianism re-inscribed as a part of the social norms governing behavior in China (Xi, 2014). But as part of a Special Issue on Confucian Psychology I edited for *Psychology and Developing Societies*, Xie, Chen et al. (2021) found that young educated Chinese in the PRC had only fragmented, distant, and abstract knowledge of Confucianism. A central core of knowledge of Confucianism remains (mainly restricted to Confucius, Mencius and the popular traditional beliefs), but it has been decontextualized from the present, through official education presenting it as ancient book knowledge, far less relevant than the technical knowledge required for modern life (Xie, Zhou et al., 2021). It remains to be seen whether Confucianism can be revived as part of the ruling ideology of the PRC. But at the very least, a revival of commitment

to the Confucian thesis of the moral mind as an endowment from heaven, could be a source of comfort and a practical guide for Chinese people seeking to navigate themselves through the materialism of contemporary times in a human-hearted and benevolent way (Y. Liu & Y. Liu, 2021; S. H. Liu, 1993). This could advance a normative psychology with international implications.

Confucianism has always included veneration of positive exemplars of virtue, so a psychology based on Confucianism would encompass a psychology of aspirations, a psychology of transformation and self-cultivation, more than theorizing about deficits and psychological dysfunction (Liu, 2021). In addition, while classic Confucianism could not be said to have successfully stimulated a systematic approach to science, Confucian Psychology could emerge as a fusion between Confucian philosophy's aspirational ontology of the moral mind, and a more scientifically minded exploration of the specific effects of traditional practices like calligraphy. Kao, Xu, and Kao (2021) report that calligraphic practice is not only useful in therapeutic contexts (like recovery of dexterity following a stroke), but also has everyday benefits in terms of calming, stress reduction, and is correlated with personality traits valued by Confucian philosophy.

I see my role as an established scholar to open doors for younger scholars to combine philosophy with psychology to create new opportunities to realize some of the better ideas of the past with the promise of future development (Liu, 2017). Chinese culture is rising, as an integral part of global society in the 21st century. As such, it will struggle with issues of ethno-cultural diversity (Huang et al., 2004; Ng, 2007). Scholars living outside the PRC, especially those with Chinese language and culture skills, should consider how they may positively influence the trajectory of the development of psychology (or other academic domains) as they advance in their careers; certainly, this was a major concern of Professor K. S. Yang (see Yang, 1999). It seems that indigenous psychology is a label that is not very popular in the PRC, for a variety of reasons (both political and otherwise). But with the imprint of Chairman's Xi's approval, the label of Confucian Psychology could be more widely accepted. Confucian Psychology might be considered as a hope and a determination that the wisdom and ideals of the past can be infused with the systems and scientific knowledge of the present to create a better future. In this way of development, instrumental gains are realized in the process of the cultivation of self together with others.

「夫仁者，己欲立而立人，己欲達而達人。能近取譬，可謂仁之方也已」 <The human hearted person (仁者), in seeking to form his or her own character, will develop

character in others; in seeking to advance him or herself, will advance others. To be able to see things from the perspective of others is a good way to attain a moral life for yourself.>

References

- 楊國樞（2008）。華人本土心理學與華人本土契合性。五南。（Yang, K. S. (2008). Chinese indigenous psychology and indigenous compatibility. Wunan.)
- Batson, C. D. (2011). *Altruism in humans*. Oxford University Press.
- Cheung, F. M., Cheung, S. F., & Zhang, J. (2004). Convergent validity of the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2: Preliminary findings with a normative sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 82(1), 92-103.
- Cheung, F. M., & Leung, K. (1998). Indigenous personality measures: Chinese examples. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(1), 233-248.
- Chen, W. W., Wu, C. W., & Yeh, K. H. (2016). How parenting and filial piety influence happiness, parent-child relationships and quality of family life in Taiwanese adult children. *Journal of Family Studies*, 22(1), 80-96.
- Choi, J. K., & Bowles, S. (2007). The coevolution of parochial altruism and war. *Science*, 318, 636-640.
- Dudgeon, P. (2017). Australian indigenous psychology. *Australian Psychologist*, 52(4), 251-254.
- Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... & Aycan, Z. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332(6033), 1100-1104.
- Han, S., Northoff, G., Vogeley, K., Wexler, B. E., Kitayama, S., & Varnum, M. E. (2013). A cultural neuroscience approach to the biosocial nature of the human brain. *Annual review of psychology*, 64, 335-359.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83.
- Hopner, V., & Liu, J. H. (2020). Relational ethics and epistemology: The case for complementary first principles in psychology. *Theory and Psychology*. DOI: 10.1177/0959354320974103

- Huang, L. L. (2016). Interpersonal harmony and conflict for Chinese people: A yin-yang perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 00847. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00847>
- Huang, L. L., Liu, J. H., & Chang, M. (2004). 'The double identity' of Taiwanese Chinese: A dilemma of politics and culture rooted in history. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7(2), 149-168.
- Kao, H. S. R., Xu, M., & Kao, T. T. (2021). Calligraphy, psychology and the Confucian literati personality. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 33(1), 54-72, DOI: 10.1177/0971333621990449
- Liu, J. H. (2013). Globalization, global consciousness, indigeneity, and indigenous psychology: An agenda to harness inequality. In K. H. Yeh (Ed.), *Chinese psychology and behavior under globalization: Philosophical reflections, theory construction, and empirical research*. Academia Sinica Press. Title in Chinese: 全球化下的華人心理與行為：哲學反思、理論建構與實證研究。
- Liu, J. H. (2017). Neo-Confucian epistemology and Chinese philosophy: For actioning psychology as a human science. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 137-149. DOI: 10.1111/ajsp.12168
- Liu, J. H. (2021). Introduction to Confucian psychology: Background, content, and an agenda for the future. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 33(1), 7-26. DOI:10.1177/0971333621990447
- Liu, J. H., Bou Zeineddine, F., Choi, S.Y., F., Zhang, R. J., Vilar, R., & Páez, D. (2021). Living historical memory: Correlations of communicative and cultural memory with national identity, social dominance orientation, and system justification across 40 countries. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 10(1), 104-116.
- Liu, J. H., & Huang, L. L. (2002). Multiple faces of indigenous Chinese psychology: Entering into a new era of engagement. Introduction to special issue on indigenous psychology, *Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies*, 3(1). 1-13.
- Liu, J. H., & Kashima, Y. (1995). Asian social psychology awakes: The inaugural conference of the Asian Association of Social Psychology (AASP) in Hong Kong. *American Asian Review*, 13, 125-131. In Chinese, *Ming Pao Monthly* (1996), Hong Kong, Jan, 45-6.
- Liu, J. H., Lawrence, B., Ward, C., & Abraham, S. (2002). Social representations of history in Malaysia and Singapore: On the relationship between national and ethnic identity. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 5(1), 3-20.

- Liu, J. H., Li, M. C., & Yue, X. D. (2010). Chinese social identity and intergroup relations: The influence of benevolent authority. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of Chinese psychology* (2nd ed) (pp. 579-597). Oxford University Press.
- Liu, J. H., & Liu, S. H. (1997). Modernism, postmodernism, and Neo-Confucian thinking: A critical history of paradigm shifts and values in academic psychology. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 15(2), 159-177.
- Liu, J. H., Milojev, P., Gil de Zúñiga, H., & Zhang, R. J. (2018). The Global Trust Inventory as a “proxy measure” for social capital: Measurement and impact in 11 democratic societies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 49(5), 789-810. DOI: 10.1177/0022022118766619
- Liu, J. H., & Ng, S. H. (2007). Connecting Asians in global perspective: Special issue on past contributions, current status, and future prospects of Asian social psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(1), 1-7.
- Liu, J. H., & Robinson, A. R. (2016). One ring to rule them all: Master discourses of enlightenment and racism from colonial to contemporary New Zealand. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(2), 137-155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2141>
- Liu, J. H., & Sibley, C. G. (2009). Culture, social representations, and peacemaking: A symbolic theory of history and identity. In C. Montiel & N. Noor (Eds.), *Peace psychology in Asia* (pp. 21-42). Springer.
- Liu, J. H., Zhang, R. J., Milojev, P., Hakim, M. A., Gil de Zúñiga, H., Schumann, S., & Páez, D. (2020). A typology of Masspersonal Information Seeking Repertoires (MISR): Global implications for political participation and subjective well-being. *New Media & Society*, 23(9). DOI: 10.1177/1461444820932556
- Liu, S. H. (1993). The psychotherapeutic function of the Confucian discipline of Hsin (mind-heart). In L. Y. Cheng, F. Cheung, & C. N. Chen (Eds.), *Psychotherapy for the Chinese* (pp. 1-17). Department of Psychiatry, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Liu, S. H. (1998). *Understanding Confucian philosophy: Classical and Sung-Ming*. Greenwood.
- Liu, Y. L., & Liu, Y. P. (2021). Self-cultivation as the basis of person making: A Confucian perspective illustrated by a case study of Zeng Guofan. *Psychology & Developing Societies*, 33(1), 7-53. DOI: 10.1177/0971333621990448.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological review*, 98(2), 224.

- Ng, S. H. (2007). Biculturalism in multicultural Hong Kong. *Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies*, 8(2), 121-140.
- Ng, S. H., Han, S., Mao, L., & Lai, J. C. (2010). Dynamic bicultural brains: fMRI study of their flexible neural representation of self and significant others in response to culture primes. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 13(2), 83-91.
- Ng, S. H., Loong, C. S. F., Liu, J. H., & Weatherall, A. (2000). Will the young support the old? An individual and family level study of filial obligations in two New Zealand cultures. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3(2), 162-182.
- Ostrom, E. (1998). A behavioral approach to the rational choice theory of collective action: Presidential address, American Political Science Association, 1997. *The American Political Science Review*, 92(1), 1-22.
- Richerson, P., Baldini, R., Bell, A. V., Demps, K., Frost, K., Hillis, V., Mathew, S., Newton, E. K., Naar, N., Newson, L., Ross, C., Smaldino, P. E., Waring, T. M., & Zefferman, M. (2016). Cultural group selection plays an essential role in explaining human cooperation: A sketch of the evidence. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 39, e30.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X1400106X>.
- Romano, A., Balliet, D., Yamagishi, T., & Liu, J. H. (2017). Parochial trust and cooperation across 17 societies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 114(48):201712921. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1712921114
- Romano, A., Sutter, M., Liu, J. H., Yamagishi, T., & Balliet, D. (2021). National parochialism is ubiquitous around the globe. *Nature Communications*, 12, 4456.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-24787-1>
- Sun, J. J. M., Hu, P., & Ng, S. H. (2015). The impact of English on education reforms in China: With special reference to the Learn-English Movement and the internationalisation of universities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Online 22 January, 2016. DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2015
- Wilson, D. S., & Wilson, E. O. (2007). Rethinking the theoretical foundation of sociobiology. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 82(4), 327-48. DOI: 10.1086/522809
- Xi, J. P. (2014). *Commemorating Confucius' 2565 birthday*. 5th Conference of International Confucianism. (in Chinese).
- Xie, T., Chen, X., Wang, D., & Liu, J. H. (2021a). Collective remembering of Confucianism in Chinese language textbooks: Official historical representations from 1949-2019. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 15, 1-13. DOI: 10.1177/1834490921993511

- Xie, T., Zhou, J., Liu, J. H., & Liao, C. C. (2021b). How does a historical system of meaning weigh on the present? Social representations of Confucianism and their role in young Chinese lives in the People's Republic of China. *Psychology & Developing Societies*, 33(1), 73-102. DOI: 10.1177/0971333621990452
- Yang, K. S. (1999). Towards an indigenous Chinese psychology: A selective review of methodological, theoretical, and empirical accomplishments. *Chinese Journal of Psychology*, 41, 181–211.
- Yang, S. Y. (2014). Wisdom and learning from important and meaningful life experiences. *Journal of Adult Development*, 21(3), 129-146.

資深主編對於撰寫及發表文化取向心理學學刊文章之建議

劉豁夫*

摘要

作為「亞洲社會心理學雜誌」的前總編輯以及「政治心理學」學刊的現任共同主編，我為在國際學刊上撰寫及發表文化取向心理學的文章提供建議。從職業發展的長期視角出發，我認為人際關係中的道德行為守則是建立高產研究綱領的基礎。教師與學生、同事與同事、導師與學員、以及學術協會中的成員資格，都是對仁道研究發展的重要關係。根據儒家教導與學習的方法，如果你將自身特質與建立起學術生活的社會作用一同培育，你的研究將會非常充實，並與人格及事業一起融合發展。以工具性角度來說，了解國際文獻的不同細分市場非常重要，以便於適當推廣你的研究。我認為你應該要把自己當作一個以文化做為取向的學者，把跨文化或本土心理學的知識來當作工具，以便應答不同領域的問題，而不是把自己侷限於一個特定範圍內。我舉例說明了不同市場如何對應不同形式的文化取向心理學，並提供了三明治與雞尾酒派對的模型，以利於引導研究文章的撰寫與發表。最後，我想表達的是，儒家心理學可能是未來華人本土心理學的一項重要途徑。

關鍵詞: 儒家心理學、本土心理學、跨文化心理學、關係倫理

劉豁夫* 紐西蘭梅西大學心理學院(J.h.liu@massey.ac.nz)